

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The claims are 24-27 and 41-42 with claims 28-40 being previously withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 24-27, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner took the position that the recitation in lines 3 and 4 of main claim 41 that "after passing the ethylene through a mixing and dissolving zone, completely dissolving the ethylene in the reaction medium stream..." is not sufficiently described in the specification.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the objected-to recitation is described in the original specification at page 6, last paragraph and page 7, first paragraph. The paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 reads as follows:

"The method as defined by the invention permits achieving optimal results because the partners participating in the process each have adequate time to

react. For example, the ethylene can pass through the free dissolution line located between the ethylene distributor, on the one hand, and the start of the chlorine distributor on the other, and is capable of dissolving completely owing to the small starting size of the bubbles produced by the microporous gas diffuser elements, so that the subsequent reaction takes place in solution." (Emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that if the "subsequent reaction" takes place in the solution, there has been a complete dissolving of the ethylene in the reaction medium. Otherwise, no reaction could take place in the (complete) solution.


The description of the invention need only be in sufficient detail so as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the same. It is respectfully submitted that from the description of the process as set forth on pages 6-7 of the specification, one skilled in the art would have sufficient information to perform the method of producing 1,2-dichloroethane or ethylene (di)chloride (EDC) using a circulating reaction medium and a catalyst as recited in claim 41, wherein after passing the ethylene through a mixing and dissolving zone, the ethylene is completely dissolved in the reaction medium stream.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the final rejection and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
MICHAEL BENJE - 1 (PCT)


COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802
FJD:jc


Allison C. Collard, Reg.No.22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg.No.26,048
Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg.No.29,298
Attorneys for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Fax No. 703-872-9307

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile-transmission to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 22, 2004.


Frederick J. Dorchak

R:\Patents\B\BENJE (PCT)\AMENDMENT - FINAL.wpd